

meaning given such term in section 2221(j)(4) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, in the bill there is a provision, which I authored and the committee accepted, which would establish a defense modernization account for, really, the first time in my knowledge. That says to the various departments of the military—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps—that they can have a defense modernization account for any savings, including money they might otherwise feel compelled to spend at the end of the year to make sure they had fulfilled their budget expectations. That is where a lot of waste goes on in budgeting, and in the Government, is the urge and incentive we inadvertently create in Government to have all Government agencies, not just the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, to spend money at the end of the year so they look like they needed all the money they originally budgeted.

Much waste comes from that. So the provision in the bill I offered will establish a defense modernization account and say to each one of the services that they will be able to take any savings that they are able to accumulate during the year and put it in this modernization account. They will be able to use it, subject to the approval of the Congress. It has to come back through the Congress, either through direct appropriation or through an approval process that we go through here. It has to come back. But subject to that, this money will be able to be used where we need it most and that is in long-term modernization.

Senator GLENN has been for this proposal, but he had some concerns about it. This amendment would modify the defense modernization account to limit the total balance of the account, to limit the number of years the funds may remain in the account, to provide for additional oversight, and to sunset the account.

I agree to all of these proposed changes and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared with our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2279) was agreed to.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. NUNN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. NUNN. On this amendment I thank Senator GLENN, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator ROTH. They were very helpful in developing these amendments and they will be having statements on this amendment on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand that concludes the action, is that

correct, tonight? It concludes action on the amendments that have been cleared. We cleared about 25 amendments. We appreciate that very much. We hope to return to the DOD authorization bill on Monday. I know there are some negotiations going on with reference to a couple of areas.

If that is negotiated successfully, we hope to be back on the DOD bill late Monday afternoon, and wrap it up. I think in a couple of hours we can complete action on this bill. I know there are a few amendments out there that might require rollcall votes. If we reach the negotiation agreement, there could be at least one amendment that will require a vote, plus the others we did not complete last night. But I understand there will be very few amendments that we would have to deal with.

So, hopefully we can complete action on the DOD authorization bill on Monday. It is a very important bill. It takes a long time. Last year I think it was 6 days. It always takes a great deal of time because it is so involved and so complex. It involves the defense of our Nation, so it deserves a great deal of consideration and debate.

I thank the managers.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, yesterday during consideration of S. 1026, a statement by Senator ROTH was inadvertently left out of the statements that were made at the time Senator COHEN introduced his amendment entitled the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1995. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ROTH's statement be printed in today's RECORD and that it be printed in the permanent RECORD for Friday, August 4, 1995, immediately following Senator COHEN's statement on the information technology amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT REFORM ACT OF 1995

• Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the amendment just introduced by Senator COHEN, myself and others will make a big step toward reforming the way the Government buys and uses information technology. The Federal Government will spend \$27 billion this year on information technology, and the GAO has reported to me that much of it will be wasted unless significant reforms are made. I want to congratulate Senator COHEN for his leadership in investigating the problems in the Government's acquisition of information technology. I also want to recognize Senator COHEN for the clarity of his vision and for his cooperation in working with me to develop this important amendment.

Mr. President, there is no disagreement about the compelling need for reform in this area. The heart of this issue is that the Federal Government is not using computers to fix its outdated management practices. In January, the GAO reported to me that Federal managers do not have the essential infor-

mation needed to do their jobs, despite spending more than \$200 billion over the last 12 years on computers. The problem is that far too often, agencies buy computers just to have one on each person's desk. The agencies buy computers like a junk food junkie buys bacon double cheese burgers and candy bars. There's lots of fat and sugar, but little healthy substance.

There is a more subtle issue here that needs to be highlighted. Modern organizations and management processes are required before computers can yield meaningful cost savings and capability improvements. If Government does not make the necessary structural and process changes, then the \$27 billion in spending on computers will be for naught. All we will have achieved is inserting 1990's technology into a 1950's organization. We will have several hundred billion dollars of new computers but no corresponding increase in capability.

Mr. President, instead of helping to solve problems, the Government process for buying and managing computer technology has become the problem. Its reliance on a tangle of redtape and bureaucracy strangles every effort to streamline and modernize Government operations. We must shift the bureaucracy from reliance on overburdened procedures and reports that no one reads; we must focus on results.

Numerous reports have documented this fact. GAO, the General Services Administration, the Office of Management and Budget and others have all found that these computer buys are poorly planned, take far too long, cost too much money and all too often produce systems that simply don't work. Once delivered, these systems are managed using practices equally ineffective.

Mr. President, GAO reported to me last January that developments in re-engineering and modern technology offer huge opportunities to reduce costs and improve services. Yet, the Federal sector has largely failed to seize upon the moment. For example, GAO has found that a veteran has to wait an average of 151 days, nearly 4 months, to get paid by the Veteran's Administration for an original compensation claim. After committing nearly \$700 million for computers and equipment to fix this problem, the waiting time actually increased! It seems the agency failed to set performance goals for its new equipment and did not consider whether or not its claims process could be improved before being automated. By October 1994, claims processing time had gone up to 228 days. This is unbelievable and unconscionable!

In a separate report provided to me just this past Monday, GAO advises that eleven federal agencies have problems with information management or systems development that are serious enough to be listed as high risk programs. GAO explained that "[t]he major reason for these problems has

been the lack of a sound process for selecting which IT initiatives to fund and for overseeing their development." It is precisely because of the great significance of this issue that I joined in developing this amendment.

Mr. President, this amendment strikes at the heart of these problems by repealing the so-called Brooks Act which has controlled the way government buys and manages information technology for the last 30 years. The Brooks Act never worked as it was intended. Its reliance upon the submission of reams of paperwork through layers of bureaucracy has not worked in the past. And, its tight bureaucratic controls are clearly not relevant to today, with information technology advancing exponentially in a highly competitive market.

Our amendment re-engineers this process, replacing red tape with a reliance on thorough, up-front investment planning and hands-on management practices which focus on bottom line results. The new process is modeled on the best practices used by America's most successful businesses. That model requires Government managers to focus like a laser on anticipating difficulties and then fixing them before they become problems. The amendment enables government agencies to accomplish these goals without additional paperwork or bureaucracy. Yet, this new process preserves the advantages and safeguards embodied in the Competition in Contracting Act.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I have four major concerns that must be more fully addressed than the current amendment will permit. First, the amendment may be interpreted as consolidating bid protests affecting information technology along with those from all other procurement. I am not satisfied that the case for such dramatic change has been made. There is much debate about this kind of consolidation and several alternative approaches have been proposed. I intend to fully consider each of these and will keep an open mind during the next 2 months, as I work on a comprehensive procurement reform bill.

Second, the current amendment does not address the excessive layers of bureaucracy in the Federal buying system which hang like a dead weight around the necks of Government program managers. This is a government-wide problem not unique to information technology and not addressed by this amendment.

Third, I believe that we must do a better job of educating and training the entire acquisition workforce—not just those involved in information technology. I do not agree with those in the administration who believe that we can fix acquisition horror stories with an interagency review team. It is no replacement for well trained program managers, who have the skills and experience to prevent horror stories from occurring in the first place.

Lastly, I am convinced that we must move boldly to dismantle the existing network of perverse personnel incentives which strangle the entrepreneurial spirit of Government program managers. We must move to paying people for good performance, rather than for growing the size of their program.

Mr. President, while the current amendment highlights important issues of good management in Government, we know that most of these problems are not unique to information technology. They beg a broader solution. Happily, last year's acquisition reform bill established the framework for solving these matters. This framework simply needs to be strengthened. To achieve that purpose, Mr. President, the Governmental Affairs Committee, in cooperation with the Armed Services and Small Business Committees, has reassembled the bi-partisan staff-level working group which produced last year's round of substantive acquisition reform. Our group has been charged with reviewing the entire spectrum of Government acquisition. We are assessing all acquisition reform legislation currently pending and have received input from many other sources. The end result of our efforts will be a broadly-gauged new bill which calls for major Governmentwide acquisition reform. We plan to move that bill forward in the fall with the intent of enacting a Governmentwide comprehensive acquisition reform bill in the next several months.●

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. I also say, with reference to the schedule next week, in a moment I will introduce the Work Opportunity Act of 1995. That debate will begin in earnest on Monday morning, at 10:30 a.m. From 9 to 10:30 there will be a period of morning business. But at 10:30 a.m. we will start serious debate on the Work Opportunity Act of 1995. I assume there will be a number of opening statements. Amendments can be offered. Votes can be expected on Monday. I do not know how long the opening statements will take. Of course, if we are able to go back to the DOD authorization bill we would have votes on that on Monday.

So I urge my colleagues to stay in close contact with their offices. I assume there will not be any votes prior to—4:30, 5 o'clock will be my best guess. It will be my hope we can complete the welfare reform measure, the Work Opportunity Act, next week. That is, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. There will not be a Saturday session next Saturday.

I guess, if necessary, if we were near completion, we will come back then on the following Monday and try to complete action on the Work Opportunity Act of 1995. I have had a discussion with the distinguished Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE. I have indicated to him that is our hope.

Also, there are a couple of appropriations bills we would like to, in our spare time, resolve next week. One is the Interior appropriations, which can be done in a matter of hours. And the other is the DOD appropriation bill, which will not be taken up until we complete action on the DOD authorization bill. That is a very, very big money bill. That might take as much as a day.

Now, obviously, I do not believe we can do all of those things next week. I hope to be in a position on Monday or Tuesday to advise my colleagues what to expect for the remainder of next week and the following week.

COMMENDATION OF JILL MAYCUMBER

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise to thank Jill Maycumber who is departing my staff after nearly 5 years of outstanding service to me, to the Senate, and to Kansas.

Like many Senate staff, Jill began her Senate career as an intern in my office. She quickly proved herself and became a key member of my staff.

For a time, Jill served as our receptionist—no doubt about it, the toughest job in Washington. But her outstanding people skills and deep desire to help Kansans made Jill the right choice to head my regional office in southeast Kansas.

When the massive floods struck the midwest in 1993, Jill Maycumber tirelessly crisscrossed the State, inspecting damage, and coordinating Federal assistance to flood victims. Hundreds of Kansans who have needed a helping hand knew who to call. They have Jill Maycumber to thank.

Earlier this year, Jill returned to Washington to help run my Senate office—not an easy task as my colleagues can attest. But most importantly, Jill took the extra time to greet thousands of constituents, always making sure that their visit to Washington and to my office was a special event.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Jill Maycumber for her outstanding service to the Senate and to Kansas. Jill can be very proud of what she has accomplished—she has truly made a difference.

I extend my heartfelt thank you and best wishes to Jill in her new career.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of Calendar 125, H.R. 4, the welfare bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which